

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/731,661	FESLER, ROBERT ERIC	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Joseph D. Manoskey	2113	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Joseph D. Manoskey. (3)_____.

(2) Matthew Anderson (Reg. No. 39.093). (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 15 November 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-5.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner called Mr. Anderson and discussed a possible 35 U.S.C. 101 issue concerning claims 1-5, the claims were directed to a program per se. Mr. Anderson and the Examiner discussed possible amendments to the claims and a deletion of the term "transmission media" from the specification. The following amendment was agreed upon "A computer program product logic encoded on computer usable media comprising instructions for". Mr. Anderson authorized the Examiner to make the changes in an Examiner's Amendment and to cite in the reason for allowance "for purposes of examination, the deletion of such embodiments is being treated as an explicit act to remove such embodiments from the scope of the claims."